importance of qualified personnel cannot be overemphasized. They n understand the processes in industries that they are regulating and she follow specific guidelines to correct violations. A review of several cc cases shows that relatively few cases are settled in court and that these ci are time-consuming and costly. Staff members need to limit the numbe cases going to court and correct violations through on-site visits and examination of data.
Several of the programs examined by the committee have substan staffs to carry out their program. For example, in 1984, Kansas spent million in support of ground water permitting and compliance staff s port. California staff requirements included 650 positions to handle b surface and ground water quality (48 in the Central Valley region ground water alone). None of the programs examined, however, had adequate number of professionally trained staff to carry out the progi requirements. State and federal funding for programs falls far short of j gram needs. Relatively low salaries and civil service requirements oi result in high turnover among state and local agency personnel, which 1 ders long-term effectiveness of the programs.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Successful ground water protection programs require adequate legal thority and substantial funding for planning and design as well as ini] mentation. Other factors affecting the successful implementation of groi water protection programs include the tractability of the problem, the; of the target group whose behavior is to be changed, the extent of behavic change required, the degree of integration within and among implement institutions, the amount of media attention directed toward the probl< and the commitment and leadership skills of implementing officials, committee would have liked to go into further detail concerning the di culties that may be involved in the eventual implementation of policies signed to protect ground water, but owing to time limitations the memt could discuss only a limited number of these issues. Many of the more atti tive programs examined, for example, California, Long Island, New Y(and Cape Cod, Massachusetts, have benefited from past federal supj under Sections 106 and 208 of the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drink Water Act.

• The committee recommends that the federal government provide finan support for development and implementation of state- or basin-level progu on the condition that within a specific time period the states are committe< developing self-supporting ground water management programs.